Texas Lutheran University May 2010 Senior Survey Results

By Jean Constable & Morgan Hale

Abstract

Since 2008 TLU has administered a senior survey to the May graduates. The May 2010 results are described in this report along with relevant comparisons to May 2008 and May 2009 results. The survey asks students to:

- Provide contact information such as email and postal mail addresses
- Rate their satisfaction with and the importance of TLU services
- Respond to five items from the National Survey of Student Engagement
- Rate the degree to which TLU helped them achieve the IGGs
- Provide post graduation plans such as employment and graduate school information
- Answer a "net promoter's score" question regarding how strongly they agree or disagree that they
 would recommend TLU to a prospective student

The resulting data will be used to assess and improve the overall educational experience of our students.

Background and Methodology

TLU began administering this institutionally focused senior survey in May 2008 as part of the SACS reaccreditation self-study. Since that time, public and federal government pressure to provide transparency and accountability in higher education has steadily increased. While this factor is a compelling reason to perform institutional assessment, the most important one is to provide information that informs strategic decisions that will improve student learning. In addition, the data provided by our students through the senior survey will help us to revise our general education curriculum.

The experience and results from prior survey years led to a few changes in the survey instrument. Instead of asking students to select characteristics that represent TLU's strengths and areas of needed improvement, the 2010 version moved those choices into the satisfaction and importance rankings. We also added four National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) questions to give us data for additional research and to allow the replication of a research project analyzing results of the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) that was done in the 2009-2010 academic year. The goal of the project is to determine what specific activities can be emphasized in our curriculum to improve student learning of higher order thinking skills, such as problem solving, critical thinking and analytic writing.

Another major change was how we kicked the survey off and administered it. Institutional Research participated in the Development department's Grad Gear Up event to launch the survey. During this event I personally asked each senior that participated to complete the survey and explained how to do so using Jenzabar's portal system. As in prior years, weekly email reminders were sent to all seniors who had not completed the survey. Participation in the May 2010 senior survey was higher than that of last year. We invited 159 seniors to complete the survey and 127 responded for a response rate of 80%, 5% higher than in 2009. TLU's new software system greatly enhanced the administration of the survey and the retrieval of the results. As in the past, the survey would not have been possible without the strong support of our IT staff.

1

Results

The demographic profile and survey results are shown below. For most survey questions, summary data is shown here with full results provided in the appendix. Appropriate comparison data to the May 2008 and May 2009 surveys is also provided for selected items.

Demographics

The table below indicates that while our survey respondents are similar in their demographic profile, women responded to the survey at a higher rate relative to their gender proportion in the student body population. In general, women respond to surveys at higher rates than men and our senior survey is no exception. (Sax, August 2003)

Demographics

	May 2010 Survey	Spring 2010 TLU Student
	Respondents	Population
Gender		
Male	34%	46%
Female	66%	54%
Ethnicity		
White	70%	62%
Non-White	30%	35%
Unknown	0%	3%

In addition, survey respondents had the same average career hours earned at 136, average career GPA of 3.2, and average age of 23 as all graduating seniors.

Below are the top 5 majors of the May 2010 respondents compared with the percent of respondents from the May 2009 and 2008 surveys. The top five majors at TLU have not changed in the past three years. According to the IPEDS data base, this information is consistent across the country. (US Department of Education)

	May 2010	May 2009	May 2008	
	Survey	Survey	Survey	
	Respondents	Respondents	Respondents	
Business Admin	20%	31%	26%	
Biology	13%	11%	13%	
Kinesiology	10%	10%	10%	
Multidisciplinary Studies	10%	7%	5%	
Psychology	13%	7%	10%	

Satisfaction and Importance of Student Services

The first survey question asked students to rate their level of satisfaction and importance with various TLU services and products.

Please indicate your level of <u>satisfaction</u> and <u>importance</u> for the services listed using the following scale:

Satisfaction	Importance
5 = Very satisfied	5 = Very important
4 = Satisfied	4 = Important
3 = Neutral	3 = Neutral
2 = Dissatisfied	2 = Unimportant
1 = Not at all satisfied	1 = Not at all important
0= No Response	0 = No Response

The results shown below are the sums of the two positive responses for the top five items. The first table is sorted by highest level of satisfaction, and the second is sorted by highest level of importance. Quality of education was ranked the highest in both satisfaction and importance. TLU faculty members are to be commended for these outstanding results. It is through their efforts that our students receive such a high quality education. The quality of faculty is ranked third in satisfaction and second in importance. The diversity of courses available was ranked 5th in both satisfaction and importance. It is apparent to me that these positive rankings could and should be used to "boldly and creatively tell the TLU story." (TLU, 2010) The appendix has complete results, including the satisfaction and importance matrices as were done last year.

Sorted by Satisfaction	Satisfaction % of Positive Responses	Importance % of Positive Responses
Services	Very Satisfied and Satisfied	Very Important and Important
Class size	94%	90%
Quality of faculty	91%	96%
Quality of education	87%	96%
Admissions services	85%	83%
Diversity of courses in Major	84%	90%

Sorted by Importance	Satisfaction % of Positive Responses	Importance % of Positive Responses
Services	Very Satisfied and Satisfied	Very Important and Important
Quality of faculty	91%	96%
Quality of education	87%	96%
Academic advising	81%	94%
Availability of course in your major	79%	94%
Diversity of courses in Major	84%	90%

NSSE Items

During the 2009-2010 academic year, Mike Czuchry, Tiffiny Sia, and I did a longitudinal study of NSSE and CLA results to determine if there were specific activities and practices from the NSSE that had a relationship to CLA results. What activities should we emphasize to increase higher order thinking skills, as measured by the CLA? To explore this question a little deeper, we included the following items with the permission of NSSE.

- 1. How often have you asked questions in class or contributed to class discussion? (Never, Sometimes, Often, Very Often)
- 2. How often have you made a class presentation? (Never, Sometimes, Often, Very Often)
- 3. During the current school year, about how many written papers or reports of between 5 and 19 pages have you done? (None, 1-4, 5-10, 11-20, more than 20)
- 4. Which of the following have you done during your time at TLU? Check all that apply (Participated in an internship, Performed community service or volunteered in the community, Participated in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together?

Because the scope of this report is limited to the senior survey, the in-depth analysis of the CLA and NSSE is not included here. However, the frequency distributions of responses to these questions within groups of majors are enlightening. All of the groups of majors employ the high impact activities in the questions above. But it is interesting to note that each group has a tendency to use 1 particular practice or activity over the others except for making class presentations. 93% of all respondents regardless of major said they very often or often made class presentations. The complete frequency distribution can be found in the appendix.

IGG Attainment

The next survey question asked:

To what degree has TLU helped you to achieve the following Institutional Goals for Graduates?

- 5 = Very Strongly
- 4 = Strongly
- 3 = Adequately
- 2 = Poorly
- 1 = Very poorly

Shown below is a comparison of the positive responses from May 2008 through May 2010.

IGGs	May 2010 Very Strongly and Strongly	May 2009 Very Strongly and Strongly	May 2008 Very Strongly and Strongly
Breadth of knowledge	74%	78%	78%
Depth of knowledge	82%	85%	85%
Understanding of the Christian faith	46%	49%	49%
Awareness and respect for diverse religions,etc.	61%	68%	68%
Write clearly & coherently, read with comprehension	84%	81%	81%
Use basic math skills	59%	64%	64%
Problem solving	81%	80%	80%
Think critically	85%	88%	88%
Commitment to active community service	38%	51%	51%
Integrated ethical perspective and sense of moral purpose	63%	71%	71%
Physical and psychological health and well-being	53%	62%	62%
Will to pursue continued growth	72%	73%	73%

The IGG positive responses for a commitment to active community service and for an understanding of the Christian faith have been consistently low over the past three years. We expect the results for community service to improve in the next year due to service learning and community service programs that have been recently implemented by the Center for Servant Leadership. In the 2010 survey, only 59% of respondents answered positively that they could use basic math skills. Positive responses to this IGG has declined in each year. As we revise our general education curriculum, perhaps this is something we should take into consideration.

Post Graduate Plans

This section of the survey asked about the student's plans after they graduate. They are asked if they will be working immediately after graduation and if they will be using the skills and knowledge acquired from TLU. They are also asked if they have applied to any graduate/professional schools, where they have been accepted, which they will attend, what type of degree they will be seeking and in what area, and any other post graduation plans they may have. When asked where they would be working after graduation, 42 out of

127 respondents or 33% named an employer. Of the 127 responses, 33 or 26% intend to go to graduate school.

Accounting firms, schools, and churches were the three most commonly mentioned employers students listed when asked about post graduation employment.

Texas State University, University of Texas- San Antonio, and University of Texas- Arlington received the most applications for admission to Graduate programs from this graduating senior class. The number of applications sent was 11, 4, and 3 respectively. Texas State University, Trinity University, and University of Texas Medical Branch accepted the highest number applicants, 5, 2, and 2 respectively.

Net Promoter's Score

A net promoter score is a measurement of customer loyalty to a firm, or in our case, a student's loyalty to TLU. Question 6 in the survey asked:

How likely are you to recommend TLU to a perspective student? Choose of	ne answer only.
☐ Very Likely	
Likely	
☐ Neutral	
Unlikely	
Not at all likely	

Over the past three years the percentage of students who choose likely or very likely to recommend TLU have been fairly consistent, with one of these two choices being selected 82%, 84%, and 88% respectively.

		May 2010	May 2009	May 2008
Very Likely	Count	63	75	92
very likely	% of Responses	50%	56%	59%
Likely	Count	41	37	46
Likely	% of Responses	32%	28%	29%
Neutral	Count	14	13	14
Neutrai	% of Responses	11%	10%	9%
Unlikely	Count	2	3	3
Unlikely	% of Responses	2%	2%	2%
Very Unlikely	Count	2	2	2
very offlikely	% of Responses	2%	1%	1%
No Dosmones	Count	4	4	0
No Response	% of Responses	4%	3%	0%

One of the limitations of asking this type of survey question is the potential bias towards positive responses of only successful students. To test our results for this problem we performed a comparison of means hypothesis test. A comparison of mean GPA within each response category revealed that a student's GPA did not affect how likely they would be to recommend TLU to prospective students. In this case, a comparison of means analysis compares the mean GPA between each answer choice (very likely, likely, etc.) for significant differences. This allowed us to see if a student having a certain GPA made them more likely to rate how likely they would be to recommend TLU more positively or negatively. With a significance level of 0.238, the results

indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in the mean GPAs within any of these response categories.

A correlation matrix was also created using various factors to determine what relationship if any exists between satisfaction with student services and the net promoters score. This analysis indicated that there was a statistically significant relationship between the responses to the net promoter question and the satisfaction with campus cultural events, campus social events, quality of the faculty, quality of their education, and their first year experience. We then did a linear regression to see if these factors could predict the students' responses to the net promoter question. Results of the regression model showed that the first year experience and campus cultural events were not significant for predicting net promoter score responses. However, quality of faculty, quality of education, and campus social events were all significant in the model. To see the details of these analyses please see the appendix.

Memorable Courses and Experiences

We asked students to provide open text responses for the following two questions:

What was your most memorable course at TLU? What was your most memorable TLU experience?

When asked what their most memorable course at TLU was, the students' answers varied widely, but there were many professors and classes that received multiple mentions. Of the 105 responses to this question, 46 specifically named professors. It is important to note that we did not ask for professor's names, just the course. Clearly our students feel very strongly about their professors.

Responses to the most memorable experience question often pertained to making new friends, Greek life, athletics, Senior Seminar, TLU Band, and conferences.

Due to the length of these responses, they will not be in the appendix, but a full list will be available upon request.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Higher education research and literature agree that students' relationship with their instructors is one of the most important factors leading to college retention and persistence. (Adelman, 2006) The results of this year's survey, as in past years, show that our faculty members create strong bonds with their students. TLU's faculty is the glue that holds our students on course. The evidence for this conclusion is sprinkled throughout the report, beginning with the top five items of satisfaction and importance to the last section on memorable courses.

As in the past two senior surveys, several of the Institutional Goals for Graduates did not garner satisfactory responses. Specifically, the use of basic math skills, understanding of the Christian faith and commitment to active community service continue to decline in positive responses. With the current general education curriculum revision, we have an enormous opportunity create a complete outcomes based learning experience that properly reflects TLU's goals and mission.

With these two main conclusions in mind, we should:

- Communicate these results to the TLU community
- Use the results to aid in the revision or the general education curriculum
- Use the results in each academic department as an aid in creating high impact activities

- Encourage and support faculty as they engage with our students
- Engage in meaningful dialogue to determine how we can intentionally improve student attainment of the IGGS or choose to implement measurable learning outcomes

References

Adelman, C. (2006). *The Toolbox Revisited: Paths to Degree Completion From High School Through College.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Kuh, G. (2008). *High-Impact Educational Practices What They Are, Who has Access to Them, And Wht They Matter.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Sax, L. J. (August 2003). Assessing Response Rates and Nonresponse Bias in Web and Paper Surveys. *Research in Higher Education, Vol. 44, No. 4*, 409-432.

TLU. (2010). Called to Lead and Serve (Action Plan - 2010-11).

US Department of Education, N. C. (n.d.). *IPEDS Data Center*. Retrieved June 2010, from IPEDS Data Center: http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter/

Appendix

Majors

iviajors								
	May 2010	May 2009	May 2008					
	Survey	Survey	Survey					
	Respondents	Respondents	Respondents					
Business Admin	20%	31%	26%					
Biology	13%	11%	13%					
Kinesiology	10%	10%	10%					
Multidisciplinary Studies	10%	7%	5%					
Psychology	13%	7%	10%					
Theology	5%	5%	2%					
Communications	2%	4%	4%					
Physics	2%	4%	3%					
History	2%	3%	5%					
Political Science	2%	3%	3%					
Sociology	2%	3%	1%					
English	2%	2%	3%					
Visual Media	2%	1%	1%					
Athletic Training	3%	1%	2%					
Chemistry	2%	1%	5%					
Computer Science	1%	1%	1%					
Dramatic Media	2%	1%	3%					
Economics	0%	1%	0%					
Math	6%	1%	1%					
Music	2%	1%	3%					
Applied Science	0%	0%	0%					

Distribution of Majors Among Degree Types

Distribution of Majors Among Degree Types									
Major	ВА	BBA	вм	BS	BA/BS	BS/BBA	BS/BS	Grand Total	
ATHL				4%				4%	
BIOL	3%			9%	1%		1%	13%	
BUSI		14%				6%		20%	
CHEM	1%			3%				3%	
COMM	4%							4%	
CSCI	1%							1%	
DRAM	1%							1%	
EDEL	1%							1%	
EDMA	1%							1%	
EDSS				1%				1%	
ENGL	3%							3%	
HIST	2%							2%	
KINS	3%			10%				13%	
MATH	3%			1%	1%			6%	
MDST	1%			1%				3%	
MUED			2%					2%	
MUSI	2%							2%	
PHYS	1%							1%	
POLS	2%							2%	
PSYC	6%			4%			1%	10%	
SOCI	2%							2%	
THEO	4%							4%	
VART	2%							2%	
VPER			1%					1%	
Grand Totals	41%	14%	3%	33%	2%	6%	1%	100%	

All Satisfaction Responses

All Satisfaction Responses								
Services		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Not at all Satisfied	No Response	
Diversity of courses in your major	Count	36	71	13	6	1	0	
Diversity of courses in your major	Percent	28%	56%	10%	5%	1%	0%	
Availability of courses in your major	Count	41	59	14	12	1	0	
Availability of courses in your major	Percent	32%	46%	11%	9%	1%	0%	
Cultural events on campus	Count	16	54	49	3	0	5	
Calculate Events on campus	Percent	13%	43%	39%	2%	0%	4%	
Laboratory facilities	Count	16	55	47	7	1	1	
Laboratory racinities	Percent	13%	43%	37%	6%	1%	1%	
Computer facilities	Count	17	62	17	21	5	5	
compater radiities	Percent	13%	49%	13%	17%	4%	4%	
Computer services	Count	20	53	30	17	3	4	
Computer services	Percent	16%	42%	24%	13%	2%	3%	
Academic support services	Count	33	60	30	2	0	2	
Academic support services	Percent	26%	47%	24%	2%	0%	2%	
Academic advising	Count	54	49	14	7	1	2	
Academic advising	Percent	43%	39%	11%	6%	1%	2%	
Career development services	Count	22	45	49	7	2	2	
Career development services	Percent	17%	35%	39%	6%	2%	2%	
Student housing services	Count	7	42	43	22	11	2	
Student nousing services	Percent	6%	33%	34%	17%	9%	2%	
Financial aid office	Count	45	49	27	4	0	2	
- Individual did office	Percent	35%	39%	21%	3%	0%	2%	
Student health services	Count	16	36	52	13	6	4	
Stadent neutri services	Percent	13%	28%	41%	10%	5%	3%	
Counseling services	Count	20	32	71	1	0	3	
Counseling Services	Percent	16%	25%	56%	1%	0%	2%	
Business office services	Count	41	63	15	5	0	3	
business office services	Percent	32%	50%	12%	4%	0%	2%	
Registration services	Count	44	60	16	5	0	2	
registration services	Percent	35%	47%	13%	4%	0%	2%	
Admissions services	Count	40	68	15	1	2	1	
, tallissions services	Percent	31%	54%	12%	1%	2%	1%	
Hein Dining food quality	Count	5	45	42	26	8	1	
Tem Dining rood quarry	Percent	4%	35%	33%	20%	6%	1%	
Lucky's Snack Bar food quality	Count	10	72	25	15	4	1	
Eucky 3 Strack but 1000 quality	Percent	8%	57%	20%	12%	3%	1%	
Bookstore	Count	33	64	20	8	1	1	
DONOLOIC	Percent	26%	50%	16%	6%	1%	1%	

All Satisfaction Responses (continued)

	All Satisfac		es (continued)				
Services		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Not at all Satisfied	No Response
Scrivices	Count	82	37	6	0	0	2
Class size	Percent	65%	29%	5%	0%	0%	2%
		55	60	9	0%		
Quality of faculty	Count					1	2
	Percent	43%	47%	7%	0%	1%	2%
Quality of education	Count	70	50	5	1	0	1
	Percent	55%	39%	4%	1%	0%	1%
First Year Experience	Count	31	56	27	6	6	1
	Percent	24%	44%	21%	5%	5%	1%
Opportunity to do research	Count	35	50	33	7	0	2
·· ,	Percent	28%	39%	26%	6%	0%	2%
Capstone learning experience	Count	33	46	29	15	1	1
cupstone rearring experience	Percent	26%	36%	23%	12%	1%	1%
Study abroad opportunities	Count	33	30	60	2	1	1
Study abroau opportunities	Percent	26%	24%	47%	2%	1%	1%
Campus Social events	Count	12	49	51	11	2	2
Campus Social events	Percent	9%	39%	40%	9%	2%	2%
On an authorities for intermedian	Count	27	30	39	24	5	2
Opportunities for internships	Percent	21%	24%	31%	19%	4%	2%
	Count	15	45	63	1	1	2
Opportunities for service learning	Percent	12%	35%	50%	1%	1%	2%
	Count	29	45	46	4	0	3
Opportunities for community service	Percent	23%	35%	36%	3%	0%	2%
	Count	40	43	31	11	0	2
Opportunities to work with faculty	Percent	31%	34%	24%	9%	0%	2%
	Count	44	63	16	0	2	2
Opportunities to work with other students							
	Percent	35%	50%	13%	0%	2%	2%

All Importance Responses

Services		Very Important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Not at all Important	No Response
Diversity of sources in your major	Count	66	48	10	0	3	0
Diversity of courses in your major	Percent	52%	38%	8%	0%	2%	0%
A	Count	66	53	7	0	1	0
Availability of courses in your major	Percent	52%	42%	6%	0%	1%	0%
Cultural quants on compus	Count	14	43	55	6	5	4
Cultural events on campus	Percent	11%	34%	43%	5%	4%	3%
Laboratory facilities	Count	38	36	42	7	2	2
Laboratory racinties	Percent	30%	28%	33%	6%	2%	2%
Computer facilities	Count	79	32	10	1	0	5
Computer facilities	Percent	62%	25%	8%	1%	0%	4%
Computer consises	Count	57	45	21	0	0	4
Computer services	Percent	45%	35%	17%	0%	0%	3%
Academic support services	Count	54	42	26	2	0	3
Academic support services	Percent	43%	33%	20%	2%	0%	2%
Academic advising	Count	87	32	7	0	0	1
Academic advising	Percent	69%	25%	6%	0%	0%	1%
Career development services	Count	45	44	36	0	0	2
	Percent	35%	35%	28%	0%	0%	2%
Student housing services	Count	39	47	35	1	3	2
Student nousing services	Percent	31%	37%	28%	1%	2%	2%
Financial aid office	Count	64	36	23	2	0	2
Thancial aid office	Percent	50%	28%	18%	2%	0%	2%
Student health services	Count	37	45	39	0	2	4
Student nearth services	Percent	29%	35%	31%	0%	2%	3%
Counseling services	Count	30	28	63	3	0	3
Courseling services	Percent	24%	22%	50%	2%	0%	2%
Business office services	Count	45	55	23	2	0	2
business office services	Percent	35%	43%	18%	2%	0%	2%
Registration services	Count	56	52	15	2	0	2
negistration services	Percent	44%	41%	12%	2%	0%	2%
Admissions services	Count	40	65	21	0	0	1
Admissions services	Percent	31%	51%	17%	0%	0%	1%
Hein Dining food quality	Count	40	53	27	3	3	1
Them binning room quanty	Percent	31%	42%	21%	2%	2%	1%
Lucky's Snack Bar food quality	Count	37	63	22	4	0	1
Lucky's Strack Dat 1000 quality	Percent	29%	50%	17%	3%	0%	1%
Bookstore	Count	39	57	28	2	0	1
DOUSTOLE	Percent	31%	45%	22%	2%	0%	1%

All Importance Responses (continued)

Services	·	Very Important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Not at all Important	No Response
Classica	Count	83	31	9	2	0	2
Class size	Percent	65%	24%	7%	2%	0%	2%
Quality of faculty	Count	110	12	3	0	0	2
Quality of faculty	Percent	87%	9%	2%	0%	0%	2%
Quality of education	Count	115	7	4	0	0	1
quality of cadeation	Percent	91%	6%	3%	0%	0%	1%
First Year Experience	Count	70	31	20	4	1	1
That real Experience	Percent	55%	24%	16%	3%	1%	1%
Opportunity to do research	Count	46	49	27	3	0	2
opportunity to do rescuren	Percent	36%	39%	21%	2%	0%	2%
Capstone learning experience	Count	48	45	30	1	1	2
Capacana rearrang experience	Percent	38%	35%	24%	1%	1%	2%
Study abroad opportunities	Count	28	20	68	7	3	1
otta, as. oda opportament	Percent	22%	16%	54%	6%	2%	1%
Campus Social events	Count	19	44	49	10	3	2
	Percent	15%	35%	39%	8%	2%	2%
Opportunities for internships	Count	52	40	31	2	0	2
	Percent	41%	31%	24%	2%	0%	2%
Opportunities for service learning	Count	20	39	62	3	0	3
	Percent	16%	31%	49%	2%	0%	2%
Opportunities for community service	Count	27	43	50	2	2	3
	Percent	21%	34%	39%	2%	2%	2%
Opportunities to work with faculty	Count	33	62	30	0	0	2
	Percent	26%	49%	24%	0%	0%	2%
Opportunities to work with other students	Count	39	59	22	3	2	2
epper taining to from their other students	Percent	31%	46%	17%	2%	2%	2%

NSSE Positive Responses by Groups of Majors

The following tables show the percentage of students within the group of majors that responded with positive answers.

Frequency Asked Questions in Class or Contributed to Class Discussions

	Often-Very	Often
Major 1	Count	%
Comm, Dram, Engl, Hist, Span, Mus, Theo, Vart, Vper	20	87%
Kines,Edu,Mued,Athl	24	86%
Math,Bio,Chem,Phys,CS	22	76%
Busi	18	72%
Econ,Pols,Psych,Soc	15	68%
Total Counts	99	

Frequency Made a Class Presentation

	Often-Very	Often
Major 1	Count	%
Kines,Edu,Mued,Athl	28	100%
Comm,Dram,Engl,Hist,Span,Mus,Theo,Vart,Vper	23	100%
Busi	23	92%
Econ,Pols,Psych,Soc	20	91%
Math,Bio,Chem,Phys,CS	24	83%
Total Counts	118	

Number of Written Papers During Current School Year between 5 & 19 Pages

	11-20	+
Major 1	Count	%
Busi	6	24%
Comm,Dram,Engl,Hist,Span,Mus,Theo,Vart,Vper	5	22%
Kines,Edu,Mued,Athl	4	14%
Math,Bio,Chem,Phys,CS	3	10%
Econ,Pols,Psych,Soc	2	10%
Total Counts	20	

Performed an Internship While at TLU

	Yes	
Major 1	Count	%
Busi	15	60%
Kines,Edu,Mued,Athl	15	54%
Econ,Pols,Psych,Soc	11	50%
Math,Bio,Chem,Phys,CS	12	41%
Comm,Dram,Engl,Hist,Span,Mus,Theo,Vart,Vper	8	35%
Total Counts	61	

Performed Community Service While at TLU

	Yes	
Major 1	Count	%
Econ,Pols,Psych,Soc	20	91%
Kines,Edu,Mued,Athl	24	86%
Math,Bio,Chem,Phys,CS	21	72%
Comm, Dram, Engl, Hist, Span, Mus, Theo, Vart, Vper	16	70%
Busi	16	64%
Total Counts	97	

Participated in Learning Communities While at TLU

	Yes	;
Major 1	Count	%
Kines,Edu,Mued,Athl	13	46%
Econ,Pols,Psych,Soc	10	45%
Math,Bio,Chem,Phys,CS	12	41%
Comm, Dram, Engl, Hist, Span, Mus, Theo, Vart, Vper	7	30%
Busi	3	12%
Total Counts	45	

The following tables contain all responses by groups of majors to the NSSE items.

Frequency Asked Questions in Class or Contributed to Class Discussions

	Very C	ften	Ofte	en	Somet	imes	Neve	er	No Resp	onse	Totals	
Major 1	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Busi	9	36%	9	36%	7	28%	0	0%	0	0%	25	100%
Math,Bio,Chem,Phys,CS	13	45%	9	31%	6	21%	0	0%	1	3%	29	100%
Kines,Edu, Mued,Athl	14	50%	10	36%	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	28	100%
Comm,Dram, Engl,Hist,Span,												
Mus,Theo,Vart,Vper	13	57%	7	30%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0	23	100%
Econ,Pols,Psych,Soc	8	36%	7	32%	7	32%	0	0%	0	0%	22	100%
Total Counts	57		42		27		0		1		127	

Frequency Made a Class Presentation

	Very C	Very Often		Often		Sometimes		er	No Response		Totals	
Major 1	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Busi	16	64%	7	28%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	25	100%
Math,Bio,Chem,Phys,CS	9	31%	15	52%	4	14%	0	0%	1	3%	29	100%
Kines,Edu, Mued,Athl	14	50%	14	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	28	100%
Comm,Dram,												
Engl,Hist,Span,												
Mus,Theo,Vart,Vper	10	43%	13	57%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0	23	100%
Econ,Pols,Psych,Soc	14	64%	6	27%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	22	100%
Total Counts	63		55		8		0		1		127	

Number of Written Papers During Current School Year between 5 & 19 Pages

	More th	han									No			
	20		11 - 2	20	5 - 1	0	1 - 4	ļ	None	9	Respo	nse	Tota	ıls
			Coun		Coun		Coun		Coun		Coun		Coun	
Major 1	Count	%	t	%	t	%	t	%	t	%	t	%	t	%
				16		52		24		0				100
Busi	2	8%	4	%	13	%	6	%	0	%	0	0%	25	%
Math,Bio,Chem,Phys,						34		48		3				100
CS	1	3%	2	7%	10	%	14	%	1	%	1	3%	29	%
				14		36		50		0				100
Kines,Edu,Mued,Athl	0	0%	4	%	10	%	14	%	0	%	0	0%	28	%
Comm,Dram,														
Engl,Hist,Span,				22		35		43						100
Mus,Theo,Vart,Vper	0	0%	5	%	8	%	10	%	0	0	0	0%	23	%
						45		45		0				100
Econ,Pols,Psych,Soc	1	5%	1	5%	10	%	10	%	0	%	0	0%	22	%
Total Counts	4		16		51		54		1				127	

Performed an Internship While at TLU

Terrormed an internation within at 120											
	Ye	Yes)	No Resp	onse	Tot	als			
Major 1	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%			
Busi	15	60%	10	40%	0	0%	25	100%			
Math,Bio,Chem,Phys,CS	12	41%	17	59%	0	0%	29	100%			
Kines,Edu, Mued,Athl	15	54%	13	46%	0	0%	28	100%			
Comm,Dram,											
Engl, Hist, Span,											
Mus,Theo,Vart, Vper	8	35%	15	65%	0	0%	23	100%			
Econ,Pols,Psych,Soc	11	50%	11	50%	0	0%	22	100%			
Total Counts	61		66				127				

Performed Community Service While at TLU

	Ye	s	No		No Resp	onse	Tot	als
Major 1	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Busi	16	64%	9	36%	0	0%	25	100%
Math,Bio,Chem,Phys,CS	21	72%	8	28%	0	0%	29	100%
Kines,Edu, Mued,Athl	24	86%	4	14%	0	0%	28	100%
Comm,Dram,								
Engl,Hist,Span,								
Mus,Theo,Vart, Vper	16	70%	7	30%	0	0%	23	100%
Econ,Pols,Psych,Soc	20	91%	2	9%	0	0%	22	100%
Total Counts	97		30				127	

Participated in Learning Communities While at TLU

	Yes		No	No		No Response		als
Major 1	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Busi	3	12%	22	88%	0	0%	25	100%
Math,Bio,Chem,Phys,CS	12	41%	17	59%	0	0%	29	100%
Kines,Edu, Mued,Athl	13	46%	15	54%	0	0%	28	100%
Comm,Dram,								
Engl,Hist,Span,								
Mus,Theo,Vart, Vper	7	30%	16	70%	0	0%	23	100%
Econ,Pols,Psych,Soc	10	45%	12	55%	0	0%	22	100%
Total Counts	45		82				127	

Institutional Goals for Graduates

IGGs		Very Strongly	Strongly	Adequat ely	Poorly	Very Poorly	No Response
Breadth of knowledge	Count	38	56	28	1	0	4
Sicuali of Mioricuse	Percent	30%	44%	22%	1%	0%	3%
Depth of knowledge	Count	50	55	17	1	0	1
eptil of knowledge	Percent	39%	43%	13%	1%	0%	1%
Understanding of the Christian faith	Count	22	37	53	6	5	4
	Percent	17%	29%	42%	5%	4%	3%
Awareness and respect for diverse religions, etc.	Count	36	42	35	8	1	5
Awareness and respect for diverse religions, etc.	Percent	28%	33%	28%	6%	1%	4%
Write clearly & coherently, read with comprehension	Count	52	56	16	0	0	4
	Percent	41%	44%	13%	0%	0%	3%
Use basic math skills	Count	34	41	40	7	1	4
	Percent	27%	32%	31%	6%	1%	3%
Problem solving	Count	51	52	19	1	0	4
	Percent	40%	41%	15%	1%	0%	3%
Think critically	Count	53	55	15	0	0	4
Timik Critically	Percent	42%	43%	12%	0%	0%	3%
Commitment to active community service	Count	17	32	57	1	3	4
communication delive community service	Percent	13%	25%	45%	1%	2%	3%
Integrated ethical perspective and sense of moral purpose	Count	26	54	37	5	0	5
integrated edition perspective and sense of moral purpose	Percent	20%	43%	29%	4%	0%	4%
Physical and psychological health and well-being	Count	29	38	4	10	2	5
rnysical and psychological health and wen-being	Percent	23%	30%	3%	8%	2%	4%
Will to pursue continued growth	Count	38	53	27	7	0	4
will to pulsue continued growth	Percent	30%	42%	21%	6%	0%	3%

Post Graduation Plans

Employers Cited

Walgreens

Price, Waterhouse, Coopers

The Home Depot

Price, Waterhouse, Coopers

Cracker Barrel

CTOMA and Coalition for Life

Tan 2000

Bealls

HEB or SA Zoo

teaching

Camp Huaco Springs

Price, Waterhouse, Coopers

SISD

Christus Santa Rosa New Braunfels

Lancer Corp

Seguin Outdoor Learning Center

Frost Bank

Body Shop

New Braunfels Sports and Spine Physical therapy

a fitness facility

school district in San Antonio

the campus post office 'til August.

KXR

a church

High School Math Teacher

SAISD

U.S. Census

a school

Price, Waterhouse, Coopers

New Braunfels Vet Clinic & Self employed photographer

Guadalupe Regional Medical Center

a high school

Voice of America

Schertz Family YMCA

Southern Golf Properties

Luther hill Ministries

Alsace LLC

Extreme Power Services

Grad Schools Cited

Grad Schools Applied to	Count
University of Houston	2
Texas State University	11
TLU Post BAC	1
San Diego State University	1
University of Minnesota	1
Purdue	1
University of Texas- San Antonio	4
Texas Christian University	2
Southwestern Methodist University	1
University of North Texas	2
University of Virginia	1
Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia	1
Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago	1
University of Texas- Dallas	2
University of Texas- Arlington	3
Texas A&M University- Kingsville	1
Trinity University	2
University of Houston- Victoria	1
Texas A&M University	2
Texas Tech	1
University of Texas- Lamar	1
Baylor University	1
University of Texas	2
Brandeis University	1
Stephen F. Austin State University	1
North Carolina State University	1
University of North Carolina- Chapel Hill	1
Colorado State University	1
University of North Carolina- Charlotte	1
University of Texas Medical Branch	2
University of Texas Southwestern	1
University of Texas Health Science Center- San Antonio	1
Baylor College of Medicine	1
Texas Tech Health Science Center	1
Texas Women's University	1
Our Lady of the Lake University	1
Wartburg Seminary	1
Kean University	1
North Carolina Central University	1

Grad Schools Attending	Count
University of Houston	1
Texas State University	5
Texas Lutheran University	1
San Diego State University	1
University of Texas- San Antonio	1
Texas Christian University	1
University of Virginia	1
Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia	1
Texas A&M University- Kingsville	1
Trinity University	2
Texas A&M University	1
Baylor University	1
University of Texas Medical Branch	2
North Carolina Central University	1

Net Promoter Score Comparison of Mean GPA within Response Categories

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Minimum	Maximum	Sig.
No Response	5	3.35760	.521734	.233327	2.491	3.825	
Very Unlikely	2	2.98900	.236174	.167000	2.822	3.156	
Unlikely	2	3.64350	.385373	.272500	3.371	3.916	
Neutral	14	3.13179	.522243	.139575	2.157	3.867	
Likely	41	3.11622	.446555	.069740	2.190	3.973	
Very Likely	63	3.30360	.481543	.060669	2.000	4.000	
Total	127	3.22669	.477570	.042377	2.000	4.000	
Between Groups							.238

Correlation of Net Promoter Score to Selected Factors

		Recommend TLU
Pearson	Recommend_TLU	1.000
Correlation	GPA	.046
	Cultural_Events_S	.162
	First_Gen	.113
	Qual_Faculty_S	.479
	Qual_Education_S	.509
	First_Yr_Exp_S	.331
	Campus_Social_Events_S	.381
Sig. (1-	Recommend_TLU	
tailed)	GPA	.304
	Cultural_Events_S	<mark>.034</mark>
	First_Gen	.102
	Qual_Faculty_S	.000
	Qual_Education_S	.000
	First_Yr_Exp_S	.000
	Campus_Social_Events_S	.000

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Predicting Net Promoter Score Response

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	70.361	9	7.818	8.331	<mark>.000</mark>
	Residual	109.797	117	.938		
	Total	180.157	126			

Linear Regression Coefficients for Net Promoter Score

				Standardized Coefficients			95.0% Co Interva	onfidence al for B
Model				Beta	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	-1.858	.955		-1.946	.054	-3.749	.032
	Gender	.317	.186	.126	1.707	.091	051	.686
	Ethnicity	.194	.202	.074	.961	.339	206	.595
	GPA	.220	.193	.088	1.140	.257	162	.601
	Cultural_Events_S	063	.091	053	689	.492	244	.118
	First_Gen	.245	.186	.102	1.320	.189	122	.612
	Qual_Faculty_S	.357	.126	.260	2.835	.005	.108	.606
	Qual_Education_S	.461	.152	.282	3.040	.003	.161	.761
	First_Yr_Exp_S	.046	.097	.041	.473	.637	146	.238
	Campus_Social_Events_S	.250	.104	.198	2.406	.018	.044	.455